

REMARKS

The title has been amended. Claims 1, 3-4, 9, and 17 have been amended. Claims 2, 5-8, 10, and 13-16 have been canceled. Claim 18 has been added. No new matter has
5 been added. Claims 1, 3-4, 9, 11-12, and 17-18 remain in the application. Reconsideration and reexamination is respectfully requested.

In paper 3, a new title was required. The title has been amended.

In paper 3, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,278,677 (Lee *et al.*). Claim 1 has been amended. Lee *et al.* do not teach or suggest an optical head that travels substantially parallel to a platen or displacement of a
10 an optical head dependent on direction of travel of the optical head.

In paper 3, claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 13 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Japanese Publication JP 11-341219 (Takahashi). Applicant respectfully traverses with respect to claim 4 before amendment. Takahashi does not teach or suggest
15 an optical head pivoting around some of the pads. Claim 4 has been amended for consistency with amended claim 1, and not for reasons of patentability. Claims 5, 7, and 13 have been canceled. Claims 1, 9, and 17 have been amended. Takahashi does not teach or suggest an optical head that travels substantially parallel to a platen or displacement of a an
optical head dependent on direction of travel of the optical head.

20 In paper 3, claims 1, 5, 9, 13 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,362,958 (Ando). Claims 5 and 13 have been canceled. Claims 1, 9, and 17 have been amended. Ando does not teach or suggest displacement of an optical head dependent on direction of travel of the optical head.

25 In paper 3, claims 5 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Japanese Publication JP 63-222573 (Yasuoka *et al.*). Claim 5 has been canceled. Claim 17 has been amended. Yasuoka *et al.* do not teach or suggest displacement of an optical head dependent on direction of travel of the optical head.

30 In paper 3, claims 2, 6, 10 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly unpatentable over Ando in view of Yasuoka *et al.* Claims 2, 6, 10, and 14 have been canceled.

In paper 3, claims 3, 8, 11, 12, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly unpatentable over Takahashi. Claims 8, 15, and 16 have been canceled. Applicant respectfully traverses with respect to claim 3 before amendment, and unamended claims 11 and 12. Claim 3 has been amended for consistency with amended claim 1, and not for 5 reasons of patentability. Takahashi does not teach or suggest pads pivoting to first and second positions depending on direction of travel (claims 3 and 11) or pivoting an optical head around a pad depending on direction of travel (claim 12). The examiner characterizes element 10 as a pad. Element 10 is not positioned between the optical head and the platen as specified in claims 3, 11, and 12. Takahashi expressly teaches away from allowing the 10 distance between the optical head and the platen to vary with movement, stating: “ . . . pressuring member 7 maintains the relative angle and the relative distance with the contact glass 1 . . . ” (Quote is from English language Abstract).

Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested. This application is considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

15

Respectfully submitted,

by A. W. Winfield
Augustus W. Winfield

20

Reg. No. 34,046

March 3, 2003
Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599
(970)-898-3142

25